

## **REMARKS**

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3-14 and 16-38 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 2 and 15 have been canceled by this amendment.

Applicants note that a number of editorial amendments have been made to the specification for grammatical and general readability purposes. No new matter has been added.

### **I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 35-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 35-38 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion such that each of these claims is now drawn to a computer-readable medium having a program stored thereon. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 35-38 are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101, and therefore, kindly request that the above-noted rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

A. Claims 1-11, 22-25, 29-31, 33, 35 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry (U.S. 2003/0095284) in view of Agranat et al. (U.S. 6,456,308).

Regarding claim 1, Applicants note that the features recited in claim 2 have been substantially incorporated into claim 1, and claim 2 has been canceled. Thus, claim 1 now recites the feature of an archiving unit that archives the plurality of the print data files into the archived file after changing a name of one print data file of the plurality of print data files to a specified

name. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Agranat does not teach or suggest such a feature.

Regarding Parry, Applicants note that this reference discloses a printing device 110 that is able to receive archived files from a source 160 (see paragraph [0016]). As explained in Parry, a processor 115 of the printing device 110 receives the archived files from the source 160, and then decompresses each file of the received archived files into separate print jobs (see paragraph [0017]).

In Parry, it is disclosed that the printing device 110 includes a control panel 140 having a display, wherein print job information such as status, retrieval and location, and any modification of this information (i.e., status, retrieval and location), can be accessed via the control panel 140 (see paragraph [0020]). In other words, in Parry, the control panel 140 is able to display updated print job information for each of the print jobs (e.g., the status, retrieval and location of each print job).

In the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that the above-noted disclosure in Parry regarding the ability of the control panel 140 to access and display updated print job information for each of the print jobs corresponds to the feature now recited in claim 1 of an archiving unit that archives the plurality of the print data files into the archived file after changing a name of one print file of the plurality of print files to a specified name (see page 4 of the Office Action). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position for numerous reasons.

First, Applicants note that claim 1 explicitly indicates that the archiving of the plurality of

print data files takes place after changing the name of one print file of the plurality of print data files to a specified name. In other words, according to claim 1, the name of one of the print data files is changed, and then the archiving of the files takes place.

In this regard, Applicants note that in Parry, the print job information corresponds to the status, retrieval and location of the print jobs. As explained above, in Parry, the archived file is created at the source 160, and is then transmitted from the source 160 to the printing device 110 (see Fig. 1). As such, Applicants respectfully submit that any modification of the print job information in Parry clearly would not take place before the creation of the archive file, but instead, would only take place after the archive file is created.

Second, Applicants note that Parry indicates that the print job information (i.e., the status, retrieval and location of the print jobs) can be modified, or in other words, that the current print job information for each of the print jobs can be updated. Thus, while Parry discloses that the status, retrieval and location of the print jobs can be updated, Applicants respectfully submit that such disclosure does not in any way whatsoever correspond to the changing of the name of one of the print data files.

For at least both of the above-noted reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Parry does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the feature recited in claim 1 of an archiving unit that archives the plurality of the print data files into the archived file after changing a name of one print data file of the plurality of print data files to a specified name. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Agranat does not cure this deficiency of Parry.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior

art references, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 4-11 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 3, Applicants note that this claim has been rewritten in independent form, and recites the feature of an archiving unit that archives one print data file of the plurality of print data files in a specified position in the archived file. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Agranat does not teach or suggest such a feature.

With respect to Parry, Applicants note that this reference discloses that upon receipt of the archived file at the printing device 110, the processor 115 decompresses the files into separate print jobs, and determines if one or more of the separate prints jobs or the archive file require additional processing (see paragraph [0017]). This “additional processing” of Parry includes transmitting the files, storing the files in a designated directory, and notifying an administrator of receipt of the files (see paragraph [0017]).

In the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that the above-noted “additional processing” of Parry corresponds to the above-noted feature recited in claim 3 of the print data file being archived in a specified position in the archived file (see Office Action at page 4). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, Applicants note that while Parry discloses the ability to perform the above-noted “additional processing”, such as storing the files in a designated directory, all of this “additional processing” takes place at the printing device (after receipt of the archived file), and not at the source 160.

Thus, in Parry, because the “additional processing” referred to by the Examiner clearly

takes place after the creation of the archived file, it is clear that the “additional processing” which is performed on the files received at the printing device of Parry cannot in any way whatsoever correspond to a print data file that is archived by an archiving unit in a specified position in the archived file.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Parry does not disclose, suggest, or otherwise render obvious at least the above-noted feature recited in claim 3 of an archiving unit that archives one print data file of the plurality of print data files in a specified position in the archived file. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Agranat fails to cure this deficiency of Parry. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 3 is patentable over the combination of Parry and Agranat, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 22, Applicants note that this claim has been amended so as to recite that the plurality of the print data files are archived into the archived file after a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files is changed to a specified name. For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Agranat does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 22 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 23-25 depend from claim 22 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 29, Applicants note that this claim recites the feature of an archiving unit operable to archive the plurality of the print data files into an archived file after the printing apparatus changes a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a

specified name. For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Agranat does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 29 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 30, Applicants note that this claim recites the feature of an archiving unit operable to archive one print data file of the plurality of the print data files in a specified position in an archived file. For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 3, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Agranat does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 30 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 31, Applicants note that this claim recites that the archiving unit archives the plurality of the print data files into the archived file after changing a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name. For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Agranat does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 31 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 33, Applicants note that this claim recites that the archiving step comprises archiving the plurality of the print data files into the archived file after changing a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name. For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that

the combination of Parry and Agranat does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 33 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 35, Applicants note this claim recites that archiving comprises archiving the plurality of the print data files into the archived file after changing a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files to a specified name. For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Agranat does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 35 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 37, Applicants note this claim recites that the plurality of the print data files are archived into the archived file after a name of one print data file of the plurality of the print data files is changed to a specified name. For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Parry and Agranat does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 37 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claims 12-21, 26-28, 32, 34, 36 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry (U.S. 2003/0095284) in view of Agranat et al. (U.S. 6,456,308), and further in view of Takashima (U.S. 6,353,484).



Regarding claim 12, Applicants note that the features recited in claim 15 have been substantially incorporated into claim 12, and claim 15 has been canceled. Thus, claim 12 now recites that the sequential transmission unit transmits sequentially the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information on a total number of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach or suggest such a feature.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has recognized that neither Parry nor Agranat discloses the above-noted feature. The Examiner, however, has taken the position that Takashima cures this deficiency of Parry and Agranat (see the Office Action at page 15). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, regarding Takashima, Applicants note that this reference discloses a printing system which is able to sequentially transmit print data (see col. 3, line 66 through col. 4, line 1). As explained in Takashima, when sequentially transmitting print data, a sequential print declaration data is transmitted which includes a client name and the number of documents to be sequentially printed (see col. 4, lines 1-4).

Based on the foregoing description of Takashima, Applicants note that while Takashima discloses the ability to transmit sequential print declaration data which indicates the total number of documents to be printed, that the sequential print declaration data of Takashima does not indicate a transmitting order of the documents to be printed.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Takashima does not disclose, suggest or



otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature of a sequential transmission unit that transmits sequentially the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information on a total number of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document, as recited in amended claim 12.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 13, 14 and 17-21 depend from claim 12 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 16, Applicants note that this claim has been rewritten in independent form, and recites the feature of a sequential transmission unit that transmits the plurality of the print data files accompanied by a flag indicating a completion of the transmission, the flag being attached to one print data file to be transmitted last, of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach or suggest such a feature.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has recognized that neither Parry nor Agranat discloses the above-noted feature. The Examiner, however, has taken the position that Takashima cures this deficiency of Parry and Agranat (see the Office Action at page 16). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, regarding Takashima, Applicants note that this reference discloses a printing system having a sub-queue 220 which stores sub-queue data such as a client name, a status, the number of documents stored therein, and a time stamp (see col. 4, lines 4-9). As disclosed in Takashima, during a queue-out process, it is possible to check how many documents are

currently stored in the sub-queue 220, wherein if the number of documents is determined to be 0, then the sub-queue data (i.e., the client name, the status, the number of documents stored therein, and the time stamp) is deleted (see col. 5, lines 14-15 and 27-30).

Based on the foregoing description of Takashima, Applicants note that while Takashima discloses the ability to check the sub-queue so as to determine how many documents are currently stored therein, that Takashima includes absolutely no disclosure or suggestion of a flag that accompanies transmitted print data, the flag indicating a completion of the transmission, and being attached to one print data file to be transmitted last, of the plurality of the print data files.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Takashima does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature of a sequential transmission unit that transmits the plurality of the print data files accompanied by a flag indicating a completion of the transmission, the flag being attached to one print data file to be transmitted last, of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document, as recited in amended claim 16.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 26, Applicants note this claim recites that the sequential acquisition unit sequentially acquires the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information on a total number of the print data files composing the print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render

obvious such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 26 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 26 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 32, Applicants note this claim recites that the sequential transmission unit transmits sequentially the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information on a total number of the plurality of the print data files composing the single print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the single print document. For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 32 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 34, Applicants note this claim recites that the sequential transmission step comprises transmitting sequentially the plurality of the print data files accompanied by information on a total number of the plurality of the print data files composing the single print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the single print document. For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 34 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 36, Applicants note this claim recites that the sequential transmission step comprises sequentially transmitting the plurality of the print data files accompanied by

information on a total number of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the print document. For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 36 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 38, Applicants note this claim recites that the plurality of the print data files acquired sequentially from the print data providing apparatus are accompanied by information on a total number of the plurality of the print data files composing the single print document and a transmitting order of the plurality of the print data files composing the single print document. For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 38 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.


### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Shigeki MATSUNAGA et al.

By:   
Kenneth W. Fields  
Registration No. 52,430  
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/jjv  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
August 29, 2007